

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant has herein added claims 3 and 4.

I. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings and for considering the references listed in the IDS's of April 4, 2006 and February 1, 2007.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 2 for minor informalities and Applicant has editorially amended these claims in a manner believed to overcome these objections.

Applicant has also replaced the Abstract with a new Abstract.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Redler (WO 00/17758).

Claim 1 relates to a peripheral device comprising a verifier that determines whether or not use of the programmable logic controller peripheral device is authorized, by checking peripheral device authentication data read out from an external storage and decrypted, against peripheral device authentication data read out from an internal storage and decrypted.

The Examiner alleges that Redler discloses such a verifier particularly pointing to page 8, paragraph 2 and Fig. 6a. The Examiner also alleges that the Smartcard of Redler allegedly corresponds to an external storage that stores at least peripheral device authentication data that has been encrypted.

Redler relates to data entry peripheral device (specifically a computer mouse) that includes an encrypter within the device itself that encrypts data entered through the peripheral device before the data is transmitted (see Abstract). Redler teaches the use of a Smartcard

component (14) from which data can be alternatively entered, as opposed to through the mouse (10) or a mini-keypad (16) (paragraph spanning pages 7 and 8). Additionally, Redler teaches that the encryption/decryption routine can be performed wherein a microcontroller in the computer mouse (10) is integrated with the Smartcard security algorithm to enable the mouse (10) to continually adopt new security methodologies and encryption/decryption algorithms (page 8, second full paragraph; paragraph spanning pages 8 and 9).

However, the Smartcard of Redler, i.e., the alleged external storage, does not store authentication data relating to the peripheral device, i.e., the mouse. In other words, Redler's Smartcard fails to store peripheral device authentication data that has been encrypted, as claimed.

Assuming *arguendo* that the Smartcard of Redler meets the claim requirements of the external storage of claim 1, Redler fails to disclose a verifier that checks peripheral device authentication data read out from the Smartcard, against peripheral device authentication data read out from an internal storage within the computer mouse. Redler merely discloses that a bi-directional authentication routine is initiated. However, it appears that this authentication routine is between the computer mouse (10) and a service provider at a remote location (page 8, first full paragraph). Accordingly, Redler fails to disclose the verifier as claimed.

This is an important distinction because the claimed invention prevents leakage of authentication data, and leakage of data that includes information assets without decreasing convenience in using the device and which does not require giving out the content of the data or authentication data to a user of the device (Application, paragraph [0009]). The claimed invention does this by storing authentication data on a peripheral device and authorizing use of the peripheral device itself (Application, paragraph [0010]).

In light of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Redler. Furthermore, because claim 2 depends from claim 1, it is submitted that this claim is patentable at least for its dependency.

III. Newly Added Claims

Applicant has added new claims 3 and 4 to provide more varied protection of the invention. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3 and 4 are patentable at least for the reasons discussed above relating to claims 1 and 2.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Stacey A. Fluhart
Registration No. 63,726